

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 21 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 7 and 13 are independent. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9 and 10 are being amended, and Claims 13 to 21 being added, herein.

The present application is a continuation application of Application Serial No. 09/282,580 (the parent application).

In an Office Action dated March 11, 2003 (i.e., the Office Action) in the parent application, the claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bugaj, et al., "Synchronized Multimedia Integration Language (SMIL) 1.0 Specification" (Bugaj) and U.S. Patent No. 5,583,980 (Anderson).

The claims of the present application, as amended herein, are believed to be patentable over the art applied in the parent application.

The present invention generally relates to using a markup language to define a visual cue that is associated with another markup language element of a multimedia presentation, the mark-up language definition of the visual cue includes visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics element attributes corresponding to the visual cue. The defined representation of the visual cue's display is superimposed over the associated visual element in the multimedia presentation based on the defined visual representation of the visual cue, together with the defined spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics of the visual cue, which are relative to the spatial and temporal characteristics of the associated element in the multimedia presentation.

By virtue of this arrangement, it is possible to define a visual cue for display during a multimedia presentation, the definition of the visual cue is in the form an XML-based tag, which includes the representation of the visual cue and the spatial and temporal characteristics, which are relative to the spatial and temporal characteristics of another element of the multimedia presentation, such that the defined representation of the visual cue's display is superimposed over the related multimedia element during the multimedia presentation.

The independent claims are amended herein to further clarify that the XML-based tag defines the visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics of the visual cue, and that the visual cue's display is superimposed over the associated visual element in the multimedia presentation based on the defined visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics of the visual cue.

Turning to the specific language of the claims, Claim 1 defines an XML-based tag for a visual cue associated to a visual element of an XML-based multimedia presentation. The visual cue's XML-based tag comprising an element attribute that defines visual representation of the visual cue, an element attribute that defines spatial characteristics of the visual cue, and an element attribute that defines temporal characteristics of the visual cue. The features of the claimed invention include the features that the defined spatial and temporal characteristics of the visual cue are relative to spatial and temporal characteristics of the associated visual element, and that the visual cue's display is superimposed over the associated visual element in the multimedia presentation based on the defined visual representation, temporal characteristics, and the spatial characteristics.

The applied art, either alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to teach or to suggest an XML-based tag for a visual cue associated with a visual element, wherein the spatial and temporal characteristics of the visual cue defined by the tag are relative to spatial and temporal characteristics of the associated visual element, and wherein, based on the visual representation, together with the spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics, defined by element attributes of the tag, the defined representation of the visual cue's display is superimposed over the associated visual element in the multimedia presentation.

Bugaj is seen to describe various elements of the SMIL language. However, none of the elements described in Bugaj is seen to teach or to suggest the XML-based tag defined in the claims of the present invention.

It is indicated in the Office Action that an anchor element described at page 30 of Bugaj discloses the visual cue of the present invention, and further that while Bugaj does not disclose spatial and temporal characteristics relative to a visual element of a multimedia element, it is asserted in the Office Action that Anderson discloses such a feature. More particularly, the Office Action refers to the anchor element described in Bugaj as being attached to visual element of a multimedia presentation, and that the "visual appearance" of anchor element is defined as a "rectangle specified within the display area of the visual element". Applicants respectfully disagree with the position taken in the Office Action

More particularly, an anchor element is not seen to comprise an element attribute that defines a visual representation. An anchor element is not displayed during a multimedia presentation, and no part of its definition of the anchor element is seen to

define a visual representation of a visual cue that is displayed superimposed over a visual element of the multimedia presentation. Rather, the anchor element described in Bugaj is seen to merely associate an area (i.e., a rectangular area) of a media object with a link. The region attribute mentioned in the Office Action is merely seen to define a region of an abstract rendering surface for an object to be displayed in a multimedia presentation, which is not seen to be used in the definition of an anchor element. Accordingly, neither the anchor element nor the region attribute, or any other portion of Bugaj for that matter, is seen to teach or to suggest an XML-based tag with element attributes that define the visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics of a visual cue, the display of which is superimposed over the associated visual element in a multimedia display based on its defined visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics.

Anderson is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Bugaj. Rather, Anderson is seen to describe recording pen movements using a series of records that specify changes in position of the pen from an initial X and Y position of the pen. (See Anderson, col. 9, line 28 to col. 9, line 31.) The data records (i.e., data records 550) used to store the pen movement are merely seen to be relative to an initial pen position, and are not seen to store a definition of spatial and temporal characteristics relative to spatial and temporal characteristics of an associated visual element. Further, the data records 550 are not seen to in any manner teach or to suggest element attributes of an XML-based tag that define spatial and temporal characteristics of a visual cue relative to a visual element in a multimedia presentation, wherein the visual cue's display is superimposed over the visual

element based on the defined visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics.

In addition and since nothing in Anderson is seen to even suggest the use of a markup language to define a visual cue element, and the use of element attributes to define characteristics of the visual cue as discussed above, Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion to combine Bugaj and Anderson in the manner suggested by the Office Action.

Accordingly, Bugaj and Anderson, either alone or in any permissible, are not seen to teach or to suggest an XML-based tag for a visual cue associated with a visual element, the spatial and temporal characteristics of the visual cue defined by the tag are relative to spatial and temporal characteristics of the associated visual element such that the representation of the visual cue's display is superimposed over the associated visual element in the multimedia presentation based on the defined visual representation, spatial characteristics and temporal characteristics of the visual cue.

Therefore, for at least the foregoing reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 7 and 13 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 67985 v 1